

REMARKS

Claims 1, 10, 12, 15, 16, 24 and 27 have been amended. Claims 1, 2 to 8, 10 to 16, 18 to 27 and 29 remain active in this application.

Claims 1 to 8 and 10 to 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. These claims have been amended to remove the allegedly non-complying subject matter.

Claims 1, 3 to 8, 10 to 16, 18 to 27 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. These claims have been amended to overcome the rejection.

Claims 16, 18 to 27 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by the Omura et al. publication. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order for claim 16 to be anticipated by Omura et al., it is necessary that each and every element and the claimed function of each and every element be found in a single reference. This is not the case herein.

Claim 16 requires circuitry for generating video data representing video frames for forming the video image of the object. No such structure is found in Omura et al.

Claim 16 further requires circuitry for dividing each video frame into a plurality of regions such that each region is representative of a portion of the object, at least one of the plurality of regions being predetermined at least one of the plurality of regions and the other of the plurality of regions being remaining ones of the plurality of regions. No such structure is found in Omura et al.

Claim 16 further requires means for selecting the at least one of the plurality of predetermined regions from the received video data. No such structure is found in Omura et al.

Claim 16 still further requires circuitry for recombining said regions of each of said video frames to form a display video image. No such structure is found in Omura et al.

Claim 16 yet further requires a display for displaying the a video frames of the display video image such that the selected region is formed as a sharp image and remaining regions of the display video image are less sharp in accordance with the

relative distance between the respective portion of the object and a reference point. No such structure is found in Omura et al.

Claims 19, 21 to 26 and 29 depend from claim 16 and therefore define patentably over Omura et al. for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 16.

In addition, claim 19 further limits claim 16 by requiring that the means for selecting be arranged such that an observer can select a region of the monitored object. No such structure is found in Omura et al.

Claim 21 further limits claim 16 by requiring that the means for selecting be arranged to select a region of said video frame defining an active entity. No such structure is found in Omura et al.

Claim 22 further limits claim 16 by requiring that the circuitry for dividing the video image into a plurality of regions be arranged for dividing the video image into a plurality of regions each defining a focal plane. No such structure is found in Omura et al.

Claim 23 further limits claim 22 by requiring that the circuitry for dividing the video image into a plurality of regions each defining a focal plane be arranged for dividing the video image into regions wherein each focal plane is representative of a different distance between a respective portion of the object and the reference point. No such structure is found in Omura et al.

Claim 24 further limits claim 23 by requiring circuitry for de-emphasizing remaining regions of the display video image. No such structure is found in Omura et al.

Claim 25 further limits claim 24 by requiring that the de-emphasising circuitry be arranged for de-emphasising remaining portions of the video image according to the distance between a respective portion of the object and the reference point. No such structure is found in Omura et al.

Claim 26 further limits claim 25 further requiring that the de-emphasising circuitry be arranged for applying greater de-emphasisation to regions of the video image that are representative of portions of the object having a greater distance between the respective portion of said object and said reference point than regions of the video image that are representative of portions of the object having a smaller distance between the respective portion of the object and the reference point. No such structure is found in Omura et al.

Claim 27 further limits claim 24 by requiring means for artificially generating each remaining region of the video image. No such structure is found in Omura et al.

Claim 29 further limits claim 24 by requiring that the circuitry for generating video data comprise a video camera for monitoring an object to produce one or more video frames and the display is capable of displaying said video frame such that remaining regions of the display video image are less sharp in accordance with the relative distance between the respective portion of the object and the video camera. No such structure is found in Omura et al.

Respectfully submitted,



Jay M. Cantor
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 19,906

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P. O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, Texas 75265
(301) 424-0355 (Phone)
(972) 917-5293 (Phone)
(301) 279-0038 (Fax)